

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Patrick Yu	Team: Squad #6	CCRB Case #: 201503946	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Thursday, 05/14/2015 4:40 PM	Location of Incident: 42 Precinct Stationhouse	Precinct: 42	18 Mo. SOL 11/14/2016	EO SOL 11/14/2016	
Date/Time CV Reported Mon, 05/18/2015 12:50 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Mon, 05/18/2015 12:50 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM David Terrell	16032	931316	042 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM David Terrell	Abuse: PO David Terrell threatened § 87(2)(b) with the use of force.	
B.POM David Terrell	Force: PO David Terrell used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
C.POM David Terrell	Force: PO David Terrell hit § 87(2)(b) against a table.	
D.POM David Terrell	Force: PO David Terrell used a chokehold against § 87(2)(b)	
E.POM David Terrell	Force: PO David Terrell restricted the breathing of § 87(2)(b)	

Case Summary

On May 18, 2015, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint with the CCRB via phone. During the Intake call, § 87(2)(b) scheduled an interview for May 22, 2015.

Between May 19, 2015, and May 21, 2015, § 87(2)(b) was called twice to a number provided and his grandmother confirmed that this was her phone number and a message was left. Additionally, § 87(2)(b) alternate phone number provided was called three times and voicemails could not be left. The calls on the aforementioned dates were attempts to reschedule § 87(2)(b)'s interview.

On May 22, 2015, § 87(2)(b) missed his scheduled interview and did not call ahead to reschedule or cancel. On May 26, 2015, a Lexis Nexis search revealed an email address and an alternate address for § 87(2)(b). On the same date, letters were sent to § 87(2)(b)'s two acquired addresses and § 87(2)(b) was called, but a voicemail could not be left. Moreover, § 87(2)(b)'s grandmother was called and a voicemail was left. On May 26, 2015, and June 2, 2015, two emails were sent to § 87(2)(b)'s email address. On May 28, 2015, § 87(2)(b) was called and he stated that he was contemplating on whether or not he wanted to proceed with the complaint. During the call, the investigator informed § 87(2)(b) of his options and he stated that he understood, but requested to be called back. On June 2, 2015, § 87(2)(b) was called and a voicemail could not be left. On June 5, 2015, a check of the NYC Department of Correction website indicated that § 87(2)(b) was not incarcerated.

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

Team: _____

Investigator: _____
Signature Print Date

Supervisor: _____
Title/Signature Print Date

Reviewer: _____
Title/Signature Print Date

Reviewer: _____
Title/Signature Print Date